REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the instant application. Claims 1-20 have been rejected by the Examiner. Claims 1, 7, 10-11 and 17 have been amended. Claims 6 and 16 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. The Applicant submits that claims 1-5, 7-15 and 17-20 are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections. No new matter has been entered.

Support for Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 10 and 11 have been amended to state *inter alia* "querying an external source of information for data missing from the service request, wherein the external source of information did not generate the service request." Support for the amendment can be found in the claims as originally filed and in paragraph [0029] of the specification. Claims 7 and 17 have been amended to depend from independent claims 1 and 11 in lieu of canceled claims 6 and 16 respectively. No new matter has been added.

Claim 10 has been amended to recite *inter alia* "A computer-readable storage medium." Support for the amendment can be found throughout the application (e.g., paragraph [0033]). No new matter has been added.

In addition, claim 11 has been amended to recite *inter alia* "a host system comprising a computer processor, the host system executing a service order control application." Support for the amendment may be found throughout the application (e.g. paragraph [0017] and FIG. 1). No new matter has been added.

Claim Objections

Claims 16 and 17 have been objected to due to antecedent basis issues. Claim 16 has been cancelled, and claim 17 has been amended to provide proper antecedent basis. Thus, no new matter has been entered.

Claim Rejections Under - 35 USC §101

Claims 10 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as failing to recite statutory subject matter. Claim 10 is directed to a storage medium and has been amended as outlined

above. Claim 11 is directed to a system and has been amended as provided above. The Applicant submits that amended claims 10 and 11 recite proper statutory subject matter pursuant to 35 USC 101 and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Claim Rejections Under - 35 USC §102

Claims 1-2, 5-7, 10-12, 15-17 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,208,345 to Sheard et al. (hereinafter "Sheard"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the outstanding rejections for at least the reasons presented herein.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for integrating service request generation systems with a service order control system. The Examiner states with respect to claim 1 that Sheard teaches "resolving any errors and inconsistencies detected from the validating resulting in a validated service request," citing Fig. 12 in support. The Examiner states that reference 340 of Sheard's Fig. 12 shows error resolution; however, Sheard describes the process step at 340 as the data packet being "removed or deleted" as opposed to being repaired. ("[I[f the data is considered corrupt 336, an error in the data packet received from the external source is verified 338, and, in response, is removed or deleted 340 for purposes of further processing," Sheard col. 14, lines 49-51). As would be understood by those skilled in the art, deleting a packet is a stopgap measure designed to continue processing and is not the same as "resolving any errors and inconsistencies detected from the validating resulting in a validated service request."

In addition the Examiner states that that Sheard teaches "wherein resolving any errors and inconsistencies includes: ... converting the converted service request back to its original data format; and transmitting the service request in its original data format back to a corresponding service request source," citing col. 8 lines 30-32 and Fig. 12 in support. The cited section of Sheard discusses converting format A to format B. However Sheard describes format A as the format created at the originating system. ("it is assumed that Application #1 produces data of type `A`," col. 7, lines 45-46). Therefore, Sheard's conversion from format A to B is not the same as converting the data "back to its original data format." Nowhere in Sheard is a conversion from format B back to A described. In addition, the Examiner's reference to the rollback step (ref. 352) in Fig. 12 does not teach this feature of the Applicant's claim. A rollback

of the transaction is not a "converted service request back to its original data format," rather it is a complete abandonment of the transaction. ("[i]f the transaction is not successful 350, a rollback of the transaction is then initiated 352", Sheard col. 14, lines 60-61). As disclosed in Sheard, a rollback of the transaction means that the transaction is rejected and all operations related to that transaction are reversed. Clearly, rejecting a transaction is not the same as "converting the converted service request back to its original data format." In addition, rolling back a transaction is not the same as "transmitting the service request in its original data format back to a corresponding service request source." As discussed previously, a rejection and rollback does not return the originally formatted data to the "corresponding service request source," but instead simply rejects the transaction and rollback the destination.

The Examiner further states that "generating a service order using the validated service request, the service order formatted to comply with formatting utilized by a service order control application" is anticipated by Sheard, citing col. 14 lines 32-43 in support. However, Sheard does not teach "generating a service order" nor does it teach generating data of any type. Sheard instead transforms and relays messages from one system to another ("implemented 310 to dequeue any incoming requests by relative priority...rule code is then invoked 312 to process the incoming request ...[a]fter the business rules have been applied, requests to one or more destination OSS applications are then routed 316 to a corresponding send queue 242, 244, 246 for delivery," col. 14 lines 26-34; emphasis added by Applicant). Therefore, Sheard cannot anticipate "generating a service order using the validated service request, the service order formatted to comply with formatting utilized by a service order control application" for at least the reason that Sheard does not teach generating data, but instead reformats incoming data.

The Examiner also states with respect to independent claim 1 that "querying an external source of information," and "the external source of information did not generate the service request" is anticipated by Sheard citing Fig. 12 reference 332 in support. Although the label for reference 332 in Figure 12 says "External Source," this reference 332 in Sheard is referring to the application that originates the transaction. ("As is shown in FIG. 12, a packet of data is received 332 from an external source. The received data then undergoes a validation process 334. If the data is considered corrupt 336, an error in the data packet received from the external source is verified 338, and, in response, is removed or deleted 340 for purposes of further processing. If

the data from the external source is determined to be valid 336, a data exchange transaction is then initiated 342," Sheard col. 14 lines 47-54; emphasis added by Applicant). Therefore, the external source disclosed in Sheard is not "an external source of information...wherein the external source of information did not generate the service request." Assuming, *arguendo*, that the external source in Sheard is the same as the Applicant's external source, which it is not, Sheard does not teach "querying" the source but instead passively "receives" data from the external source. Additionally, even Sheard is not considered to be a passive receiver of the external data, Sheard does not teach using that data for "resolving any errors and inconsistencies" as is recited in the Applicant's claim. Therefore, because Sheard does not anticipate each and every feature of claim 1, the Applicant submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by Sheard and is in condition for allowance.

Independent <u>claim 10</u> is directed to a storage medium for integrating service request generation systems with a service order control system. Claim 10 recites, *inter alia*, "converting data in a service request into an open data format resulting in a converted service request;

validating the converted service request utilizing user-defined business logic, the validating including:

performing accuracy checks of data fields and data within the converted service request; and

performing consistency checks of data and data fields within the converted service request;

resolving any errors and inconsistencies detected from the validating resulting in a validated service request;

generating a service order using the validated service request, the service order formatted to comply with formatting utilized by a service order control application; and

transmitting the service order to the service order control application;

wherein resolving any errors and inconsistencies includes:

querying an external source of information for data missing from the service request, wherein the external source of information did not generate the service request;

converting the converted service request back to its original data format; and

transmitting the service request in its original data format back to a corresponding service request source."

As indicated above with respect to claim 1, Sheard does not teach or suggest these features. For at least this reason, claim 10 is not anticipated by Sheard and is in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 11 is directed to a system for integrating service request generation systems with a service order control system. Claim 11 recites, *inter alia*, "a host system comprising a computer processor, the host system executing a service order control application;

a data repository in communication with the host system;

a service order generator executing on the host system, the service order generator including:

a service request normalizer;

a rules engine comprising:

a field validation module; and

a customer/service validation module; and

a service order writer;

a link to at least one service request source;

wherein the service order generator performs:

converting data in a service request received from the at least one service order

source into an open data format resulting in a converted service request;

validating the converted service request utilizing user-defined business logic, the validating including:

performing accuracy checks of data fields and data within the converted service request; and

performing consistency checks of data and data fields within the converted service request;

resolving any errors and inconsistencies detected from the validating resulting in a validated service request;

generating a service order using the validated service request, the service order formatted to comply with formatting utilized by a service order control application; and

transmitting the service order to the service order control application;

wherein resolving any errors and inconsistencies includes:

querying an external source of information for data missing from the service request, wherein the external source of information did not generate the service request;

converting the converted service request back to its original data format; and

transmitting the service request in its original data format back to a corresponding service request source."

As indicated above with respect to claim 1, Sheard does not teach or suggest these features. For at least this reason, claim 11 is not anticipated by Sheard and is in condition for allowance.

Dependent claims 2, 5, and 7 depend from independent claim 1 and are therefore patentable over Sheard for at least the reason that they depend from what should be an allowable base claim. Dependent claims 12, 15, 17 and 20 depend from independent claim 11 and are

therefore patentable over Sheard for at least the reason that they depend from what should be an allowable base claim.

Claims 6 and 16 have been canceled thereby rendering their rejections moot.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

Claims 3-4, 13-14, and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,208,345 to Sheard et al. (hereinafter "Sheard") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0061062 to Tucker (hereinafter "Tucker").

Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and is therefore allowable for at least the reason that it depends from an allowable base claim. The Examiner states with regard to claim 4 that Tucker teaches "wherein the performing consistency checks of data and data fields include: checking a first data field within the converted service request against subsequent data fields within the converted service request, wherein the first data field holds data corresponding to data held in at least one of the subsequent data fields," citing paragraph [0045]. The Examiner specifically points to "checks for completeness may include verifying that the required fields are present" in Tucker for support. Although Tucker teaches verifying that the "fields are present," Tucker does not teach "first data field holds data corresponding to data held in at least one of the subsequent data fields." Tucker in fact, does not correlate data from the first field to any other field in the data. Therefore, for at least those reasons, Sheard in view of Tucker does not teach or suggest all of the features recited in claim 4. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Dependent claims 14 is substantially similar to claim 4 and therefore, is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 4.

Dependent claim 3 depends from independent claim 1 and is therefore patentable over Sheard in view of Tucker for at least the reason that it depends from what should be an allowable base claim.

Dependent claims 13 and 18 depend from independent claim 11 and are therefore patentable over Sheard in view of Tucker for at least the reason that they depend from what should be an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

Applicant is not conceding in this application that the original claims are not patentable over the Examiner's rejection. Rather, the present claim amendments are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks fully comply with the Office Action and that the claims herein should now be allowable to the Applicant. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance is requested. It is submitted that the foregoing amendments and remarks should render the case in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicant's attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130. In the event that an extension of time is required, or may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time that is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to the above-identified Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP
Applicant's Attorneys

By: ___/Marisa J. Dubuc/_____
    Marisa J. Dubuc
    Registration No. 46,673
    Customer No. 36192

Date: February 25, 2009
Address: 20 Church Street, 22nd Floor
           Hartford, CT 06103
Telephone: (860) 286-2929
Fax: (860) 286-0115

030728 / BLL-0181   17